


REMARKS

The new claims are supported inter alia by originally filed claim 11 and by the disclosure on page 4, second complete paragraph.

The Examiner, in the Office Action dated 11 October 2001, takes the position (paragraph 4) that "microstructure 6 or 7 ... is considered as a chip scale package". Applicant respectfully notes that the microstructures 6 or 7 in Furuyama are indeed chip scale while still bare, however once they are packaged (by means of "packaging layer 16 which is sealed over the microstructure" -- paragraph 4 of the Office Action), the resulting package, comprising not only the bare microstructures but also the bulky packaging layer sealed over them, is no longer "chip scale". In contrast, in new claim 38, the package, including not only the bare microstructure but also the crystalline substrate and the packaging layer, is itself very small, or chip scale.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark S. Bicks
Reg. No. 28,770

ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: May 11, 2002